

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/719,955	Applicant(s) TANIGUCHI ET AL.
	Examiner Myles D. Robinson	Art Unit 2625

All Participants:**Status of Application:** Final Rejection

(1) Myles D. Robinson. (3) _____.
 (2) Steven M. Jensen (Reg. No. 42,693). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 14 December 2009**Time:** 3:30PM**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.**Rejection(s) discussed:**

35 U.S.C. §102 (b) and §103(a)

Claims discussed:

1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 12 - 16 and 19 - 21

Prior art documents discussed:

Voticky (U.S. 6,351,764) and Eggleston (U.S. 5,764,899)

Part II.**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/Myles D. Robinson/
 Examiner, Art Unit 2625

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner called to alert the Applicant that claim 21 is in condition for allowance yet the remaining claims will be finally rejected based upon the prior art of the previous non-final Office Action. The Examiner asked if the Applicant would rather cancel all claims except claim 21 to place the application in condition of allowance or review the final rejection Office Action. The Applicant elected to review the final rejection Office Action with more detailed explanation of the remaining claims do not overcome the prior art of record. .